Name	**:**	Isaiah Bozimo
Address	**:**	Broderick Bozimo & Company G2, Ocean Centre Oladipo Diya Road Abuja, FCT Nigeria
Email	**:**	isaiah@broderickbozimo.com
Tel	**:**	+234 703 463 2020
Nationality	**:**	Nigerian and British

Education

Institution	***Degree obtained***
Queen Mary, University of London (2012 – 2013)	Master of Laws, Comparative & International Dispute Resolution. Modules included international investment arbitration, international commercial arbitration, and international commercial litigation.
Nigerian Law School (2005-2006)	Barrister-at-Law
London School of Economics and Political Science (2004 – 2005)	Master of Laws. Modules included international commercial arbitration, the English Arbitration Act 1996, and alternative dispute resolution.
University of Central Lancashire (2000 – 2003)	Bachelor of Laws

Professional Experience

Date from – Date to	***Position***	***Description***
2017 to Present	Partner, Broderick Bozimo & Company (BBaC). Nigeria.	I represent state-owned entities, corporations, and high-net-worth individuals in domestic and international arbitration. I have also served as Sole Arbitrator and Co-Arbitrator under *ad-hoc* and institutional rules.

Date from – Date to	***Position***	***Description***
2006 to 2017	Senior Associate, Ikwueto. Nigeria.	I led a team of five lawyers in the firm's disputes practice. We focused on Nigerian and cross-border commercial disputes.

Arbitration Experience

Selective Representative Matters	
As Arbitrator:	- Sole arbitrator in an international concession dispute submitted to ICC arbitration, Nairobi Seat, Tanzanian Law. - Sole arbitrator in arbitration under the Lagos Court of Arbitration Rules arising out of a disputed financial transaction. - Party appointed arbitrator in an ad hoc arbitration with claims exceeding NGN 3.8 Billion, arising out of construction works for an infrastructural project. - Party appointed arbitrator in a dispute arising from an oil pipeline project and submitted to ad hoc arbitration. - Sole arbitrator in an ad hoc arbitration involving the interpretation of provisions of a commercial lease agreement. - Sole arbitrator in an ad hoc arbitration involving agency and corruption issues.
As Counsel:	- Represented a major building contractor in related claims exceeding NGN 2 Billion arising from the construction of an international trade centre and a large-scale retail facility and submitted to ad hoc arbitration - Acting as lead counsel for a development bank in related claims exceeding NGN 1 Billion, arising from a disputed loan transaction submitted to ad hoc arbitration. - Acted as lead counsel for a claimant corporation in an NGN 900 million power supply dispute submitted to ad hoc arbitration. - Acted as co-counsel for a claimant corporation in a USD 300 million gas supply dispute submitted to ICC Arbitration.

Selective Representative Matters	
	- Co-counsel for a claimant corporation in a USD 600 million dispute connected with an ad hoc arbitration award.

Awards, accolades, and other professional responsibilities.

Who's Who Legal recognises me as a Future Leader in Arbitration. I am a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (CIArb) and a member of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) Arbitration Panel. I am also a member of SIAC's Africa Users Council and the Young SIAC Committee.

I lead the Arbitration & Dispute Resolution Thematic Area of the National Assembly Business Environment Roundtable (NASSBER) and serve on the Council of the Nigerian Bar Association Section on Business Law. I am on CIArb's Accredited Faculty and provide professional training in the Institute's programmes.

Editorial Roles.

- Member of the Review Committee, CIArb Guidance Note on Remote Dispute Resolution Proceedings.

- Contributing Author, *Rethinking the Role of African National Courts in Arbitration*. 2018, Wolters Kluwer.

- Contributor, Delos *Guide to Arbitration Places.*

- Contributor, the *New York Convention Guide.*

Arbitrator Style and Preferences

Inspired by the desire for greater accessibility to information concerning potential arbitrators' procedural preferences, I have set out below a general description of my approach to several common issues. Naturally, these are not statements of how I would act in a particular manner. I offer them as an indication of my general thoughts on the process.

Delegation: do you believe it is acceptable for an arbitrator to delegate work to a junior lawyer who is not a member of the tribunal?

No.

Tribunal secretaries: do you believe that it is acceptable for a tribunal to appoint a secretary to assist it with the administrative tasks relating to the proceedings?

I have no objection to the use of tribunal secretaries for appropriate purposes in appropriate cases. In any case, the tribunal should discuss a proposal to appoint a secretary with the parties in advance.

Preliminary or early decisions: do you believe it is appropriate for tribunals to attempt to identify and decide potentially dispositive issues early in a case, even if one of the parties does not consent to this?

Yes, depending on the circumstances. I am open to entertaining potentially dispositive motions where a party can demonstrate a likelihood that a motion will resolve or materially narrow the issues to be decided without undue cost or disruption of the proceeding. In my experience, the party that sees a likelihood of prevailing on such a motion will generally raise the issue itself. Where appropriate, I may ask the parties at the organisational conference whether there are any such issues. If no party raises such an issue, I will only do so myself if it appeared so obvious and so essential to the case that failure to raise it would risk unnecessarily prolonging the proceeding.

Settlement facilitation: do you believe arbitral tribunals should offer to assist parties in reaching a settlement, and actively look for opportunities to do so?

I believe tribunals should remind parties of the benefits of settling cases but not assist the parties in reaching a settlement.

Early views of strengths and weaknesses of claims and defenses: do you believe arbitrators should provide parties with their preliminary views of the strengths and weaknesses of their claims and defenses?

No. It is my duty to keep an open mind until: (i) each party has had a full and fair opportunity to submit evidence and arguments, and (ii) I have had a chance to fully consider each party's submission.

IBA Rules of Evidence: do you believe international tribunals should apply the rules in proceedings even if one of the parties' objects to their application?

I do not believe that tribunals should impose 'soft law' such as the IBA Rules on the parties if one of them objects. However, tribunals should encourage the parties to consider their use in the interests of consistency in arbitral procedure.

Document disclosure: do you believe it is appropriate for international tribunals to grant a party's request for e-discovery?

I would follow the parties' agreement and the arbitration rules to the extent that they expressly or implicitly addressed the issue. If those documents were silent on the question, I might well allow narrow, targeted e-discovery requests for specific documents (e.g., specific emails) if the cost is not disproportionate to the potential relevance of the documents.

Skeleton arguments: do you prefer for parties to provide a summary of their arguments to the tribunal before the hearing?

Yes. This practice can help the parties save time and expense by identifying potentially dispositive issues, focusing discovery (if any), and streamlining the presentation of evidence.

Chair nominations: do you believe co-arbitrators should consult with the parties who appointed them before proposing names for a chair to the other co-arbitrator?

Not invariably, but where appropriate.

Arbitrator interviews: are you available to be interviewed by the parties before being appointed (in accordance, for example, with the Guidelines for Arbitrator Interviews published by the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators)?

Yes.

Arbitrator interviews: if you are appointed as a co-arbitrator, do you think parties should interview a prospective chair that you and the other co-arbitrator have identified, before agreeing the appointment?

No.

Counsel misconduct: for a counsel that has engaged in misconduct, do you generally take steps while the proceedings are underway, or include consideration of the misconduct in a subsequent award of costs, or do you believe it is not within the responsibility of the arbitral tribunal? (choose only one) (a) Discipline during proceedings, immediately when misconduct occurs (b) Discipline

both during proceedings and in subsequent award on costs (c) Take misconduct into consideration in cost award (d) Do not believe counsel misconduct is responsibility of the tribunal.

Fortunately, this is not a situation that I have encountered. If I did, I may proceed as follows:

- **During the proceedings, I would impose tailored discipline, which, in some cases, could include an immediate award of relevant costs.**

- **Later, if awarding costs for the entire case, I will take the misconduct into account as appropriate.**

- **I any event, I my focus will be to keep the proceedings on tract while remaining fair to both parties (and always after notice and an opportunity to be heard).**

Costs: do you believe it is appropriate for a party to recover all its reasonable costs (including counsel fees) if it has prevailed on its claims or defenses?

Yes, subject to the parties' contrary agreement. Absent a contrary agreement, I would expect that a party seeking its costs would provide reasonable supporting documentation.

Costs: do you believe it is appropriate for a party to recover the reasonable costs of any in-house counsel who conducted or assisted the party's conduct of the arbitration?

It depends. Where in-house counsel serve as lead or assisting counsel, their costs should be treated in the same way as if they were outside counsel.

Do you view yourself as conducting proceedings more in the style of the common law, the civil law, or no preference/depends on situation?

I have a common law background. However, I conduct proceedings in the style of "international arbitration," namely with a view to a prompt, efficient determination of the dispute in conformity with party expectations, and without excessive discovery or lengthy hearings.

Please provide a statement of how you prefer to conduct arbitration proceedings in cases in which you have been, or could be, appointed.

To elaborate on the above, I believe that an arbitration proceeding should be managed as an expedited, joint business project whose "deliverables" are the final evidentiary record and the final award.